Cl **30**   *SC* **30.5.1.1.2**   *P* **35**   *L* **17**   # 70

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *(bucket2)*

Inconsistent wording for the cable type
P32L30, P33L17, P33L44, P73L31, P73L35: shielded balanced copper cabling
P35L17, P35L27, P35L37: shielded copper balanced cable

SuggestedRemedy

Change: shielded copper balanced cable
To: shielded balanced copper cabling
on P35L17, P35L27, & P35L37.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In the following locations P35L17, P35L27, & P35L37...
Change: "shielded copper balanced cable"
To: "shielded balanced copper cable"

Cl **161**   *SC* **161.5.2.6**   *P* **123**   *L* **41**   # 85

Huber, Tom   Nokia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *(bucket2)*

Incorrect list of PCS lanes for FEC lane 1: 0, 5, 9, 13, and 17

SuggestedRemedy

Change 0 to 1.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #73.

Cl **161**   *SC* **161.5.2.6**   *P* **123**   *L* **41**   # 73

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *(bucket2)*

I believe there is a typo as it doesn't make sense to transmit PCS lane 0 on both FEC
lanes 0 and 1. The second "0" should be "1" on FEC lane 1. This change also makes it
match with Figure 161-3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: the alignment marker payloads corresponding to PCS lanes 0, 5, 9, 13, and 17
are transmitted on FEC lane 1,
To: the alignment marker payloads corresponding to PCS lanes 1, 5, 9, 13, and 17 are
transmitted on FEC lane 1,

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
A large portion of the alignment marker payloads are repeated as described in the variable
mapping in subclause 161.5.2.6, but not all; for example the BIP fields are not repeated
across the lanes. So the statement in Draft 2.0 is not correct as currently written.
Make the following changes to simplify the text and remove the incorrect statement.
Change:
"The result of the alignment marker mapping function is a deterministic mapping between
alignment marker payloads and FEC lanes. The alignment marker payloads corresponding
to PCS lanes 0, 4, 8, 12, and 16 are transmitted on FEC lane 0, the alignment marker
payloads corresponding to PCS lanes 0, 5, 9, 13, and 17 are transmitted on FEC lane 1,
and so on (see Figure 161–3)."
To:
"The result of the alignment marker mapping function is a deterministic mapping between
alignment marker payloads and FEC lanes (see Figure 161–3)."

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.9.4.3.3**   *P* **162**   *L* **18**   # 196

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *(bucket2)*

There are no mofications to COM paramters in Table 162-14.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this bullet.   (Note that if this is done then step f on page 162 line 20 will become
step e).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: This response was updated on 2021/5/18.]

Delete item "b)" and renumber the list items appropriately.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **162**
SC **162.9.4.3.3**

Page 1 of 1
2021-05-19 10:00:49 P